



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/419,749	10/16/1999	TAD A. DEFFLER	22074661-255	1735

26453 7590 03/30/2004

BAKER & MCKENZIE
805 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Applicants' Amendment

1. Claims 1-9 are pending. Claim 9 has been amended in this communication filed 12/08/03 entered as Amendment F with an Extension of Time for two months, paper no. 33.

2. The amendment to the claim has overcome the Claim Objection and is hereby withdrawn.

3. Applicants' Specification objection still remains because only the errors cited in the Office Action of 07/31/03 have been corrected. Applicants' are respectfully requested to check the Specification for other typographical and grammatical errors. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

Drawings

4. New corrected drawings are required in this application because the labeling in places on the drawings is illegible. For example: Fig. 1, element 112 (the second "property ?" (unable to read what is written after "property")) and fig. 2, element 112 has a similar problem. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office

Art Unit: 3624

action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The 112 first paragraph and 112 second paragraph rejections still remain for the reasons addressed here below. Applicants' explanation of "the keyword repository being built dynamically to include the extended command ... ". The Examiner does not find on any of the pages of the Specification where the "keyword repository is built dynamically to include the extended command ...". The pages 4, 6, and 8 do not mention that a keyword repository is built dynamically to include the extended command ..." as claimed in claim 1. Page 4 recites in line 18 "repository, thereby allowing dynamic extension of a macro language" and in lines 21-23 recite "In the present invention, a mechanism for dynamically registering new macro commands in a registry is also". Page 6, lines 21-24 recites "... is directed to an extensible macro language which may be extended dynamically in the runtime environment without having to rebuild and recompile the macro language". Page 8, lines 11-14 recite "executable codes may be stored in the repository 112 as a pointer to the actual codes 114 ... repository 112 includes one or more keywords and associated codes, may be dynamically modified, e.g., new keywords." These recitations are not interpreted as "the keyword repository being built dynamically." Nothing states that the keyword repository is built let alone being built dynamically.

6. The corrected drawings have not been received in response to the request for the correction of Figure 1 and Figure 2.

Art Unit: 3624


7. The amendment filed on 12/08/03 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): the Applicants' reply does not comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.111 (b) because it does not include fully addressing the Specification Objection, fully addressing the 112 first and 112 second paragraph rejections, and the requested corrected drawings for Figure 1, element 112 (the second "property?" (unable to read what is written after "property") and Figure 2, element 112 has a similar problem. See 37 C.F.R. 1.111 (b). Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, Applicants' are given a time period within which to supply the omission or correction and response to the Election/Restriction Requirement which is **ONE (1) MONTH or Thirty (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer in order to avoid abandonment. Extensions of this time period maybe granted under 37 CFR 1.136(a).

This action is **NON-FINAL**. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


E. Colbert
March 29, 2004

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' Representative, Ms. Eunhee Park, discussed the Office Action rejections under 35 U.S.C 112 second paragraph, the claim, drawings, and specification objections and the 103 rejection with the Aho reference. Ms. Park pointed to the specification, pages 4, 6, and 8 as having support for the 112 second paragraph rejection reciting in the claim limitation "the keyword repository being built dynamically to include the extended command ..." in claim 1. The Examiner agreed to consider the arguments about what the Aho reference does not teach, to consult with Bob Wiendhart (SPRE-Special Review Examiner) and to call Ms. Park back to let her know what was decided. The Examiner called Ms. Park back and left a voicemail message saying the application had been sent to the Electronic Search Center for a search and if there are no references found the application can possibly be allowed. However, the Examiner stated that no promise of allowance could be made yet and that if Ms. Park thought the application might be close to going abandoned before the search has been completed, it was suggested that at least the formal drawings should be submitted.